

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

DYSON TECHNOLOGY LIMITED)
and DYSON, INC.,)
Plaintiffs,)
v.) Civil Action No. 05-434 GMS
MAYTAG CORPORATION,) REDACTED FOR PUBLIC FILING
Defendant.)
)

**DEFENDANT HOOVER, INC.'S MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN OPPOSITION
TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION *IN LIMINE* NO. 6 TO EXCLUDE EVIDENCE OF
MAYTAG'S REPEAT BIN EMPTYING TEST AND OPENING BRIEF IN SUPPORT THEREOF**

Francis DiGiovanni (#3189)
James D. Heisman (#2746)
Connolly Bove Lodge & Hutz LLP
The Nemours Building
1007 N. Orange Street
Wilmington, DE 19899
Phone (302) 658-9141

Of Counsel:

Kimball R. Anderson
Stephen P. Durchslag
Winston & Strawn LLP
35 West Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60601
Phone (312) 558-5600

Ray L. Weber
Laura J. Gentilcore
Renner, Kenner, Greive, Bobak, Taylor & Weber
400 First National Tower
Akron, OH 44308
Phone (330) 376-1242

Defendant Counterclaim Plaintiff Hoover, Inc. (“Hoover”)¹ respectfully submits this answering brief in opposition to the motion *in limine* by Plaintiff Counterclaim Defendants Dyson Technology Limited and Dyson, Inc. (collectively “Dyson”) to exclude evidence of Hoover’s repeat bin emptying test.

I. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Dyson claims that Dyson-brand vacuum cleaners never lose suction (“no loss of suction” claim).

¹

II. ARGUMENT

“The Rules of Evidence embody a strong and undeniable preference for admitting any evidence which has the potential for assisting the trier of fact.” *Kannankeril v. Terminix Intern, Inc.*, 128 F.3d 802, 806 (3d Cir. 1997). “Rule 702, which governs the admissibility of expert testimony, has a liberal policy of admissibility.” *Id.*

Where a consumer can be expected to reasonably perceive that a defendant's advertising claim of superiority applies to the real world, the defendant must demonstrate a correlation between its laboratory tests and the real world. *See Church & Dwight Co., Inc. v. S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc.*, 873 F. Supp. 893, 905 (D.N.J. 1994) (*citing Johnson & Johnson-Merck Consumer Pharm. Co. v. Rhone-Poulenc Rorer Pharm. Inc.*, 19 F.3d 125, 127 (3d Cir. 1994)).

Where no recognized industry standard exists, novel methodologies may be employed by experts with sufficient expertise and experience if such novel methodologies are reliable. *See Kannankeril*, 128 F.3d at 806. "Admissibility decisions focus on the expert's methods and reasoning." *Kannankeril*, 128 F.3d at 806.

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, Defendant Counterclaim Plaintiff Hoover respectfully requests that this Court deny Dyson's Motion *in Limine* No. 6.

Dated: April 23, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

HOOVER, INC.

/s/ Francis DiGiovanni

Francis DiGiovanni (#3189)

James D. Heisman (#2746)

Connolly Bove Lodge & Hutz LLP

The Nemours Building

1007 N. Orange Street

Wilmington, DE 19899

Phone (302) 658-9141

Of Counsel:

Kimball R. Anderson

Stephen P. Durchslag

Winston & Strawn LLP

35 West Wacker Drive

Chicago, IL 60601

Phone (312) 558-5600

Ray L. Weber

Laura J. Gentilcore

Renner, Kenner, Greive, Bobak, Taylor & Weber

400 First National Tower

Akron, OH 44308

Phone (330) 376-1242

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Francis DiGiovanni, hereby certify that on April 23, 2007, copies of the foregoing document were served on the following counsel of record in the manner indicated:

BY HAND DELIVERY AND E-MAIL:

C. Barr Flinn
John W. Shaw
Adam Poff
Young Conaway Stargatt & Taylor LLP
The Brandywine Building
1000 West Street, 17th Floor
Wilmington, Delaware 19801

BY UNITED STATES MAIL AND E-MAIL:

Garrard R. Beeney
Richard C. Pepperman, II
James T. Williams
Keith McKenna
Sullivan & Cromwell LLP
125 Broad Street
New York, NY 10004

Steven F. Reich
Jeffrey S. Edelstein
Manatt, Phelps & Phillips, LLP
7 Times Square
New York, NY 10004

/s/Francis DiGiovanni
Francis DiGiovanni (#3189)